

REMARKS

Pending Claims

Claims 1, 4-5 and 8 have been amended. Claims 2-3 have been canceled and 7 was canceled by prior amendment. New claim 10 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-6 and 8-10 are currently pending in this application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 5 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. In response, Applicants have rewritten claim 5 in independent form to include all the limitations of base claim 1. There were no intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 5 is now believed to be allowable. It is further believed that claim 6 is also allowable since claim 6 depends from allowable base claim 5.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanajima et al., US Pat. Appl. Pub. 2002/0008691 (hereafter "Hanajima"), in view of Shahoian et al., US Pat. No. 6,822,635 (hereafter "Shahoian"). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to include that the display screen provided with said touch panel is moved in a direction of the pushing pressure, a moving quantity of the display screen being changed continuously according to an increase of the pushing pressure (see, e.g., Applicants' specification, page 23, line 27 - page 24, line 16 and FIGS. 7B and 7C). Independent claims 1 and 8 have further been amended to include that a changing rate of the moving quantity of the display screen responsive to the increase of the pushing pressure in the second processing is different from a changing rate of the moving quantity of the display screen in the first processing (see, e.g., Applicants' specification, page 23, line 27 - page 24, line 16 and FIGS. 7B and 7C). As illustrated in FIGS. 7B and 7C, according to Applicants' invention, the gradients (rate of change) of characteristics resulting from the pushing pressure are different for the pressure range of $P1 \leq P < P2$ (the first processing) and the larger pressure range of $P2 \leq P$ (the second processing). Because the moving rate of the display screen is distinctly changed at a prescribed pushing pressure value exceeding $P2$, the display screen of the invention is able to provide the advantages not taught or suggested by the prior art, such as, in one embodiment, being able to emulate a touch feeling similar to pressing a mechanical button (page 24, lines 3-4).

Hanajima, on the other hand, teaches a touch panel device 2 that detects a depressing pressure when the touch panel 9 is depressed with a finger, and then supplies a depressing pressure signal indicating the depressing pressure to a personal computer 3 (see, e.g., Hanajima at par. 0033). The processing means

selects a process to be executed on the basis of the depressing pressure indicated by the depressing pressure signal from the touch panel device (par. 0036). Thus, Hanajima fails to teach or suggest that a display screen provided with a touch panel is moved in a direction of the pushing pressure, and a moving quantity of the display screen is changed continuously according to an increase of the pushing pressure, as recited in Applicants' amended claims 1 and 8. Hanajima further fails to teach or suggest that a changing rate of the moving quantity of the display screen responsive to the increase of the pushing pressure in the second processing is different from a changing rate of the moving quantity of the display screen in the first processing, as also recited in Applicants' amended claims 1 and 8.

Shahoian discloses a display screen for providing haptic feedback to a user in which regions of the display screen can each be associated with haptic sensations (see, e.g., col. 34, lines 11-23 of Shahoian). However, Shahoian fails to teach or suggest that when a display screen provided with a touch panel is moved in a direction of the pushing pressure, a moving quantity of the display screen is changed continuously according to an increase of the pushing pressure, as recited in Applicants' amended claims 1 and 8. Shahoian further fails to teach or suggest that a changing rate of the moving quantity of the display screen responsive to the increase of the pushing pressure in a second processing is different from a changing rate of the moving quantity of the display screen in a first processing, as also recited in Applicants' claims 1 and 8.

Because both Shahoian and Hanajima fail to teach these above-recited features of Applicants' invention, as set forth in amended claims 1 and 8, the combination of Shahoian with Hanajima also cannot properly be said to teach these features. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 8 are patentable over Hanajima combined with Shahoian and/or the other art of record, whether taken singly or in combination.

Claims 4, 6, 9 and 10 are dependent claims, and are allowable at least because they depend from allowable base claims. Further, new claim 10 finds support at, e.g., Applicants' specification, page 23, line 27 through page 24, line 4, and FIG. 7B. Hanajima combined with Shahoian and/or the other art of record, whether taken singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest that the changing rate of the moving quantity of the display screen in the second processing increases rapidly as compared with the changing rate of the moving quantity in the first processing, as recited in new claim 10. Accordingly, claim 10 is additionally patentable over the art of record.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Colin D. Barnitz
Registration No. 35,061

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: April 3, 2007